

Non-Markovianity degree for random unitary evolution

Dariusz Chruściński and Filip A. Wudarski

*Institute of Physics, Faculty of Physics, Astronomy and Informatics
Nicolaus Copernicus University, Grudziądzka 5/7, 87-100 Toruń, Poland*

We analyze the non-Markovianity degree for random unitary evolution of d -level quantum systems. It is shown how non-Markovianity degree is characterized in terms of local decoherence rates. In particular we derive a sufficient condition for vanishing of the backflow of information.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Yz, 03.65.Ta, 42.50.Lc

Recently, much effort was devoted to the analysis of non-Markovian quantum evolution [1]–[26] (see also [27] for the recent review). The two most popular approaches are based on divisibility of the corresponding dynamical map [5–7] and distinguishability of states [8]. Other approaches use quantum entanglement [5], quantum Fisher information [9], fidelity [10], mutual information [11, 12], channel capacity [13, 23], geometry of the set of accessible states [14], non-Markovianity degree [20] and the quantum regression theorem [24, 25]. There is also an alternative approach based on the so called Diósi-Gisin-Strunz non-Markovian quantum state diffusion equation [26] but we do not consider it in this paper.

In what follows we analyze non-Markovianity degree of random unitary quantum evolution of d -level quantum system. Let us briefly recall the notion of non-Markovianity degree [20]: if Λ_t is a dynamical map then it is called k -divisible iff the corresponding propagator $V_{t,s}$ defined *via* $\Lambda_t = V_{t,s}\Lambda_s$ ($t \geq s$) defines k -positive map [28]. Hence, if the system Hilbert space is d -dimensional, then $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. Map which is d -divisible we call CP-divisible (the corresponding propagator is completely positive (CP)) and 1-divisible we call P-divisible (the corresponding propagator is positive (P)). The evolution is Markovian iff the corresponding dynamical map is CP-divisible. Note that if Λ_t is k -divisible, then it is necessarily l -divisible for all $l < k$. Maps which are even not P-divisible we call essentially non-Markovian. Having defined the notion of k -divisibility one assigns the non-Markovianity degree as follows: if Λ_t is k -divisible (but not $(k+1)$ -divisible), then its non-Markovianity degree $\text{NMD}[\Lambda_t] = d - k$. Clearly, if Λ_t is Markovian, then $\text{NMD}[\Lambda_t] = 0$ and if Λ_t is essentially non-Markovian, then $\text{NMD}[\Lambda_t] = d$.

Let us recall that a quantum channel $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is called random unitary if its Kraus representation is given by

$$\mathcal{E}(X) = \sum_k p_k U_k X U_k^\dagger, \quad (1)$$

where U_k is a collection of unitary operators and p_k stands for a probability distribution. The characteristic feature of such channels is unitality, that is, $\mathcal{E}(\mathbb{I}) = \mathbb{I}$. Actually, for qubits ($\dim \mathcal{H} = 2$), it turns out [29] that any unital channel is random unitary. However, for higher level systems it is no longer true. A random unitary dy-

namics is represented by a dynamical map Λ_t such that for all $t > 0$ the channel Λ_t is random unitary.

Consider the following set of unitary generalized spin (or Weyl) operators in $\mathbb{C}^d$ defined by

$$U_{kl} = \sum_{m=0}^{d-1} \omega^{kl} |m\rangle \langle m+l|, \quad (2)$$

with $\omega = e^{2\pi i/d}$. They satisfy well known relations

$$U_{kl} U_{rs} = \omega^{ks} U_{k+r, l+s}, \quad U_{kl}^\dagger = \omega^{kl} U_{-k, -l}. \quad (3)$$

Introducing a single index $\alpha \equiv (m, n)$ via $\alpha = md + n$ ($\alpha = 0, \dots, d^2 - 1$). One has $U_0 = \mathbb{I}$ and $\text{Tr}[U_\alpha U_\beta^\dagger] = d\delta_{\alpha\beta}$ for $\alpha, \beta = 0, 1, \dots, d^2 - 1$. In this paper we consider a random unitary evolution defined by the following dynamical map

$$\Lambda_t(X) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{d^2-1} p_\alpha(t) U_\alpha X U_\alpha^\dagger, \quad (4)$$

with time-dependent probability distribution $p_\alpha(t)$ satisfying $p_0(0) = 1$. Assuming time-local Master Equation

$$\dot{\Lambda}_t = L_t \Lambda_t, \quad (5)$$

it is well known that Λ_t is CP-divisible iff L_t has the standard Lindblad form for all $t \geq 0$. To find the time-local generator L_t let us observe that

$$\Lambda_t(U_\alpha) = \lambda_\alpha(t) U_\alpha, \quad (6)$$

where the eigenvalues $\lambda_\alpha(t)$ read as follows

$$\lambda_\alpha(t) = \sum_{\alpha, \beta=0}^{d^2-1} H_{\alpha\beta} p_\beta(t), \quad (7)$$

with H being $d^2 \times d^2$ Hadamard matrix defined by

$$H_{ij,kl} = \omega^{-il+jk}.$$

This definition implies that $H_{\alpha\beta}$ is a Hermitian matrix. Simple algebra gives

$$L_t(X) = \sum_{k=1}^{d^2-1} \gamma_k(t) [U_k X U_k^\dagger - X], \quad (8)$$

where the local decoherence rates read

$$\gamma_\alpha(t) = \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{\beta=0}^{d^2-1} H_{\alpha\beta} \mu_\beta(t) , \quad (9)$$

and

$$\mu_\alpha(t) = \frac{\dot{\lambda}_\alpha(t)}{\lambda_\alpha(t)} . \quad (10)$$

Note, that the sum in (8) starts from $k = 1$ [30] and hence there are $d^2 - 1$ independent decoherence rates $\gamma_k(t)$. Indeed, formula (9) shows that $\gamma_0 = -\sum_{k=1}^{d^2-1} \gamma_k$. It is therefore clear that Λ_t defines CP-divisible dynamics iff $\gamma_k(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \geq 0$. Note, that given a map, i.e. a set of $p_\alpha(t)$, it is in general very hard to check for CP-divisibility. Conversely, given a time-local generator (8) it is very hard to check whether it gives rise to a legitimate quantum evolution described by CP map Λ_t . The generator L_t is legitimate iff $p_\alpha(t) \geq 0$ for $\alpha = 0, 1, \dots, d^2 - 1$. Using $H^{-1} = \frac{1}{d^2} H$ one easily inverts (9) and finds

$$p_\alpha(t) = \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{\beta=0}^{d^2-1} H_{\alpha\beta} \lambda_\beta(t) , \quad (11)$$

where

$$\lambda_\beta(t) = \exp \left[\sum_{k=1}^{d^2-1} H_{\beta k} \Gamma_k(t) \right] , \quad (12)$$

with $\Gamma_k(t) = \int_0^t \gamma_k(\tau) d\tau$. Conditions $p_\alpha(t) \geq 0$ provides highly nontrivial constraints for $\gamma_k(t)$. Note, that to have $p_\alpha(t) \geq 0$ it is sufficient $\Gamma_k(t) \geq 0$. Indeed, since $\Lambda_t = \exp[\int_0^t L_\tau d\tau]$ and

$$\int_0^t L_\tau(X) d\tau = \sum_{k=1}^{d^2-1} \Gamma_k(t) [U_k X U_k^\dagger - X] , \quad (13)$$

it follows that if $\Gamma_k(t) \geq 0$ then $\int_0^t L_\tau d\tau$ defines a legitimate Lindblad generator and hence $\exp[\int_0^t L_\tau d\tau]$ defines a CP-map. However, it should be stressed that $\Gamma_k(t) \geq 0$ is not a necessary condition.

Example 1 For $d = 2$ one has $U_k = \sigma_k$ ($k = 1, 2, 3$), where σ_k are Pauli matrices and hence [21, 31]

$$\lambda_1(t) = \exp(-2[\Gamma_2(t) + \Gamma_3(t)]) , \quad + \text{ cycl. perm.}$$

The corresponding map $\Lambda_t = \exp[\int_0^t L_\tau d\tau]$ is CP iff

$$\lambda_1(t) + \lambda_2(t) \leq 1 + \lambda_3(t) , \quad + \text{ cycl. perm.} \quad (14)$$

An interesting example of $\gamma_k(t)$ satisfying (14) but violating $\Gamma_k(t) \geq 0$ was recently provided in [21]:

$$\gamma_1(t) = \gamma_2(t) = \frac{c}{2} , \quad \gamma_3(t) = -\frac{c}{2} \tanh(ct) , \quad (15)$$

with $c > 0$. One finds $p_3(t) = 0$ and

$$p_1(t) = p_2(t) = \frac{1}{4} [1 - e^{-ct}] ,$$

and hence the corresponding dynamical map reads

$$\Lambda_t(\rho) = \frac{1 + e^{-ct}}{2} \rho + \frac{1 - e^{-ct}}{4} (\sigma_1 \rho \sigma_1 + \sigma_2 \rho \sigma_2) . \quad (16)$$

Interestingly Λ_t is a convex combination of two Markovian semigroups $\Lambda_t^{(1)}$ and $\Lambda_t^{(2)}$ generated by

$$L_t^{(k)}(\rho) = \frac{c}{2} [\sigma_k \rho \sigma_k - \rho] ; \quad k = 1, 2. \quad (17)$$

One finds $\Lambda_t = \frac{1}{2} (\Lambda_t^{(1)} + \Lambda_t^{(2)})$.

Example 2 This construction may be easily generalized for $d = 3$. Let us assume that

$$\gamma_k(t) = \frac{c}{3} , \quad \text{for } k \neq 4, 8 .$$

Note, that $[U_4, U_8] = 0$ (see Appendix for the list of U_k). We look for $\gamma(t) := \gamma_4(t) = \gamma_8(t)$ such that $p_4(t) = p_8(t) = 0$. One easily finds

$$\gamma(t) = -\frac{2c}{3} \frac{e^{2ct} - e^{-ct}}{e^{2ct} + 2e^{-ct}} , \quad (18)$$

which proves that $\gamma(t) < 0$ for $t > 0$. Note that $p_k(t) = p(t)$ ($k \neq 4, 8$) with

$$p(t) = \frac{1}{9} (1 - e^{-ct/3}) . \quad (19)$$

Similarly as for $d = 2$ this evolution may be represented as a convex combination of three Markovian semigroups $\Lambda_t^{(1)}, \Lambda_t^{(2)}, \Lambda_t^{(3)}$ generated by

$$\begin{aligned} L_t^{(1)}(\rho) &= c[U_1 \rho U_1^\dagger + U_2 \rho U_2^\dagger - 2\rho] , \\ L_t^{(2)}(\rho) &= c[U_3 \rho U_3^\dagger + U_6 \rho U_6^\dagger - 2\rho] , \\ L_t^{(3)}(\rho) &= c[U_5 \rho U_5^\dagger + U_7 \rho U_7^\dagger - 2\rho] . \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Note, that $[U_1, U_2] = [U_3, U_6] = [U_5, U_7] = 0$. One finds $\Lambda_t = \frac{1}{3} (\Lambda_t^{(1)} + \Lambda_t^{(2)} + \Lambda_t^{(3)})$. Again, $\Gamma_4(t) = \Gamma_8(t) < 0$ but the evolution Λ_t is well defined. It is clear that one may generalize this example for arbitrary d .

Let us observe that L_t may be rewritten as follows

$$L_t(X) = \Phi_t(X) + 2\gamma_0(t)X , \quad (21)$$

where the map Φ_t is defined via

$$\Phi_t(X) = \sum_{k=1}^{d^2-1} \gamma_k(t) U_k X U_k^\dagger - \gamma_0(t) U_0 X U_0^\dagger , \quad (22)$$

and

$$\gamma_0(t) = -\sum_{k=1}^{d^2-1} \gamma_k(t) .$$

Now, the corresponding solution $V_{t,s} = \exp[\int_s^t L_\tau d\tau]$ reads

$$V_{t,s} = v(t;s) \exp \left[\int_s^t \Phi_\tau d\tau \right],$$

where the scaling factor $v(t;s)$ is given by

$$v(t;s) = \exp \left(2 \int_s^t \gamma_0(\tau) d\tau \right).$$

It is therefore clear that if the map Φ_t is k -positive for all $t \geq 0$, then Λ_t is k -divisible.

To check for k -divisibility we shall use the following result from [32]: let $\Phi(X) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{d^2-1} a_\alpha U_\alpha X U_\alpha^\dagger$ with U_α being Weyl unitary operators and real parameters a_α . Clearly, if $a_\alpha \geq 0$, then Φ is CP. Suppose now that some a_α are negative, that is,

$$\Phi(X) = \sum_{i=1}^M b_i U_i X U_i^\dagger - \sum_{j=1}^N c_j U_j X U_j^\dagger, \quad (23)$$

with $M + N = d^2$ and $b_i, c_j \geq 0$ (a set $\{U_i, U_j\}$ defines a permutation of $\{U_\alpha\}$). It means that Φ is a difference of two CP maps. Let k be a positive integer such that $kN < d$. One proves [32] that if

$$b_i \geq \frac{k}{d - kN} \sum_{j=1}^N c_j; \quad i = 1, \dots, M, \quad (24)$$

then Φ is k -positive. Moreover, if (24) is violated for at least one $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, then Φ is not $(k+1)$ -positive. Hence, conditions (24) are sufficient for k -positivity and necessary for $(k+1)$ -positivity.

Note, that if $k = 1$, then $N \leq d - 1$ and hence at each moment of time there are at most $d - 1$ negative rates $\gamma_l(t)$. Let $N = d - 1$ and suppose, that $\gamma_1(t), \dots, \gamma_{d-1}(t) < 0$. Formula (24) implies

$$\gamma_k(t) \geq |\gamma_1(t)| + \dots + |\gamma_{d-1}(t)|, \quad (25)$$

or equivalently

$$\gamma_k(t) + \gamma_1(t) + \dots + \gamma_{d-1}(t) \geq 0, \quad (26)$$

for $k = d, \dots, d^2 - 1$. Replacing $\{\gamma_1(t), \dots, \gamma_{d-1}(t)\}$ by an arbitrary set $\{\gamma_{i_1}(t), \dots, \gamma_{i_{d-1}}(t)\}$ one finds that if for any d -tuple $\{i_1, \dots, i_d\} \subset \{1, 2, \dots, d^2 - 1\}$ the following condition is satisfied

$$\gamma_{i_1}(t) + \dots + \gamma_{i_d}(t) \geq 0, \quad (27)$$

for all $t \geq 0$, then Λ_t is P-divisible.

Remark 1 It is easy to show that random unitary evolution is P-divisible iff it satisfies the well known BLP condition [8]:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\Lambda_t(\rho_1 - \rho_2)\|_{\text{tr}} \leq 0, \quad (28)$$

for any pair of initial states ρ_1 and ρ_2 . Hence, (27) implies (28).

Remark 2 Interestingly, if the random unitary evolution is P-divisible, then

$$\frac{d}{dt} S(\Lambda_t(\rho)) \geq 0, \quad (29)$$

where S denotes the von Neumann entropy. It shows that whenever the inequality (29) is violated the evolution is essentially non-Markovian.

Remark 3 Authors of [14] introduced the geometric measure of non-Markovianity via

$$\mathcal{N}[\Lambda_t] = \frac{1}{V(0)} \int_{\frac{d}{dt} V(t) > 0} \frac{dV(t)}{dt} dt, \quad (30)$$

where $V(t)$ denotes the volume of admissible states at time t . It is clear that for Markovian evolution one has $\frac{d}{dt} V(t) \leq 0$. Note, that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{d^2-1} \gamma_k(t) = -\gamma_0(t) \geq 0, \quad (31)$$

guaranties $\mathcal{N}[\Lambda_t] = 0$. The geometric condition (31) is much weaker than condition for P-divisibility (27).

Example 3 For $d = 2$ conditions (27) give

$$\gamma_1(t) + \gamma_2(t) \geq 0, \gamma_1(t) + \gamma_3(t) \geq 0, \gamma_2(t) + \gamma_3(t) \geq 0.$$

Actually, it was shown [31] that these conditions are also necessary for P-divisibility. Note, that $\gamma_k(t)$ defined in (15) satisfy these conditions and hence the corresponding dynamics is P-divisible (but not CP-divisible since $\gamma_3(t) < 0$).

Example 4 For $d = 3$ conditions (27) give

$$\gamma_{i_1}(t) + \gamma_{i_2}(t) + \gamma_{i_3}(t) \geq 0, \quad (32)$$

for all triples $\{i_1, i_2, i_3\} \subset \{1, \dots, 8\}$. Conditions (32) are sufficient (but not necessary) for P-divisibility. For $k = 2$ one has $N \leq 1$ and hence taking $N = 1$ the formula (24) implies: if

$$\gamma_{i_1}(t) + 2\gamma_{i_2}(t) \geq 0, \quad (33)$$

for all pairs $\{i_1, i_2\} \subset \{1, \dots, 8\}$, then the evolution is 2-divisible. Note, that conditions (32) are sufficient for P-divisibility and necessary for 2-divisibility whereas (33) are sufficient for 2-divisibility. It is clear that (33) are much stronger than (32). Hence, if all $\gamma_k(t) \geq 0$ the evolution is Markovian and $\text{NMD}[\Lambda_t] = 0$. If $\gamma_k(t) \not\geq 0$ but condition (33) is satisfied then $\text{NMD}[\Lambda_t] = 1$, that is, the evolution is non-Markovian but still 2-divisible. Finally, if (33) is violated but (32) is satisfied then $\text{NMD}[\Lambda_t] = 2$, that is, the evolution is non-Markovian but still P-divisible. However, the violation (32) does not necessarily mean that Λ_t is essentially non-Markovian. Actually, we conjecture that this evolution is P-divisible.

To summarize: we derived a hierarchy of conditions which guarantee k -divisibility of the random unitary evolution of d -level quantum system. It is shown how these conditions are related to well known BLP condition [8] and the geometric condition [14].

Acknowledgements

This paper was partially supported by the National Science Center project DEC- 2011/03/B/ST2/00136.

Appendix

Weyl matrices for $d = 3$: $U_0 = \mathbb{I}_3$ and

$$U_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad U_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$U_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad U_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega \\ \omega^2 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$U_5 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ \omega & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad U_6 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega \end{pmatrix},$$

$$U_7 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega^2 \\ \omega & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad U_8 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ \omega^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

with $\omega = e^{2\pi i/3}$ and $\omega^2 = \omega^* = e^{-2\pi i/3}$.

-
- [1] H.-P. Breuer and B. Vacchini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101** (2008) 140402; Phys. Rev. E **79**, 041147 (2009).
 - [2] J. Piilo, S. Maniscalco, K. Härkönen and K.-A. Suominen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 180402 (2008); Phys. Rev. A **79**, 062112 (2009).
 - [3] D. Chruściński and A. Kossakowski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 070406 (2010); Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 050402 (2013); EPL **97**, 20005 (2012).
 - [4] A. Budini, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 012124 (2013); Phys. Rev. A **88**, 032115 (2013); Phys. Rev. E **89**, 012147 (2014).
 - [5] Á. Rivas, S.F. Huelga, and M.B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 050403 (2010).
 - [6] M. M. Wolf, J. Eisert, T. S. Cubitt and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 150402 (2008).
 - [7] S. C. Hou, X. X. Yi, S. X. Yu, and C. H. Oh, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 062115 (2011).
 - [8] H.-P. Breuer, E.-M. Laine, J. Piilo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 210401 (2009).
 - [9] X.-M. Lu, X. Wang, and C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 042103 (2010).
 - [10] A. K. Rajagopal, A. R. Usha Devi, and R. W. Rendell, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 042107 (2010).
 - [11] S. Luo, S. Fu, and H. Song, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 044101 (2012).
 - [12] M. Jiang and S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 034101 (2013).
 - [13] B. Bylicka, D. Chruściński, and S. Maniscalco, Scientific Reports, **4**, 5720 (2014).
 - [14] S. Lorenzo, F. Plastina, M. Paternostro, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 020102(R) (2013).
 - [15] F. Ciccarello, G. M. Palma, and V. Giovannetti, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 040103(R) (2013).
 - [16] J.-S. Xu et. al. Nature Comm., **4**, 2851 (2013).
 - [17] R. Lo Franco, B. Bellomo, S. Maniscalco, and G. Compagno, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **27**, 1245053 (2013).
 - [18] T. J. G. Apollaro, S. Lorenzo, C. Di Franco, F. Plastina, and M. Paternostro, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 012310 (2014).
 - [19] N. K. Bernardes, A. R. R. Carvalho, C. H. Monken, and M. F. Santos, *Smallest set for non-Markovian dynamics in collisional models*, arXiv:1404.0019.
 - [20] D. Chruściński and S. Maniscalco, Phys. Rev. Lett, **112**, 120404 (2014).
 - [21] E. Andersson, J. D. Cresser, and M. J. W. Hall, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 042120 (2014).
 - [22] F. F. Fanchini, et. al. Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 210402 (2014).
 - [23] C. Addis, B. Bylicka, D. Chruściński, and S. Maniscalco, arXiv:1402.4975.
 - [24] N. Lo Gullo, I. Sinayskiy, T. Busch, F. Petruccione, arXiv:1401.1126.
 - [25] G. Guarnieri, A. Smirne, and B. Vacchini, arXiv:1406.5340.
 - [26] T. Yu, L. Diósi, N. Gisin, W. T. Strunz, Phys. Lett. A **265**, 331 (2000); W. T. Strunz and T. Yu, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 052115 (2004).
 - [27] Á. Rivas, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, arXiv:1405.0303, to appear in Rep. Prog. Phys.
 - [28] A map $\Phi : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is k -positive iff $\mathbb{1}_k \otimes \Phi$ is positive, where $\mathbb{1}_k$ denotes identity map acting in the space of $k \times k$ complex matrices.
 - [29] L. J. Landau and R. F. Streater, J. Linear Alg. and Appl., **193**, 107 (1993).
 - [30] We use "relativistic" notation: $\alpha, \beta = 0, 1, \dots, d^2 - 1$ and $k, l = 1, \dots, d^2 - 1$.
 - [31] D. Chruściński, and F. A. Wudarski, Phys. Lett. A **377**, 1425 (2013).
 - [32] D. Chruściński, and A. Kossakowski, Comm. Math. Phys. **290**, 1051 (2009).